

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

DRAWING(S):

The drawings in the application are accepted. A voluntary amendment is made to drawing sheet 4/4 for minor editorial corrections. The attached drawing sheet 4/4 includes the corrections made to Fig. 4 and replaces the original drawing sheet 4/4. The attached red-marked drawing sheet 4/4 indicates in red the corrections made to Fig. 4.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

REMARKS – General

The applicant has made a voluntary amendment to the specification for minor editorial corrections. Applicant has made a voluntary amendment to a drawing sheet as indicated for minor editorial corrections to Fig. 4.

Also claims 2 to 6 are canceled and replaced with new claims to define the claims more distinctly so as to overcome the technical objections and rejections and define the invention patentably over the prior art.

Applicant has added 8 new claims. The new claims contain no new matter, and the recited elements are derived from the applicant's specification.

The Objection to Claim 4

The Office Action states "Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim is in improper dependent form. The Examiner further interprets claim 4 as being an independent claim. Appropriate correction is required."

The applicant agrees with the Examiner and claim 4 is rewritten as an independent claim. Also since claim 4 is an independent claim, the incorrect referring "of claim 2" in step (a), is deleted to comply under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 4th paragraph.

The corrections put claim 4 in proper independent form.

The applicant thanks the Examiner for recognizing claim 4 as an independent claim.

The Rejection of Claim 1 Under § 112 Overcome

The Office Action states "Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 1 recites the limitation "whereby a human can view and hear said internet advertising only if said human wants. The claims relate to advertising images and the blocking of such images, and recite nothing of an advertisement sound or the control thereof. As a result, dependent claims have been rejected."

Claim 1 is in original status.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the O.A. on the enablement requirement under § 112, first paragraph, and that claim 1 “contains subject matter which was not described in the specification...”

The specification clearly describes all of the elements, all of the subject matter, and the manner of making and using claim 1 “in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected”.

As mentioned the O.A. also rejected claim 1 because “Claim 1 recites the limitation “whereby a human can view and hear said internet advertising only if said human wants. The claims relate to advertising images and the blocking of such images, and recite nothing of an advertisement sound or the control thereof.”

The applicant agrees with this statement because the claims precisely, “recite nothing of an advertisement sound or the control thereof.”

Thus for the claims to additionally recite “an advertisement sound or the control thereof.” is unnecessary, superfluous, and would constitute excess wordiness.

However, the applicant disagrees with this rejection of claim 1 because the specification describes in many instances to “an advertisement sound or the control thereof.” The specification contains the supporting terms that describes 4 references and 5 equivalent references to an “advertisement sound”, and 3 references to “the control” of the advertisement sounds.

The 4 References to “an advertisement sound”:

1. The first reference to an advertisement sound is the word “hear” that is written in “see and hear the advertisement” on page 14, paragraph 3, line 2.
2. The second reference is the word “singing” that is written in “him singing and dancing in the rain” on page 13, paragraph 2, line 4.
3. The third reference is the words “music video” that is written in “a short clip from a music video” on page 13, paragraph 4, line 2.
4. The fourth reference is the word “volume” that is written in “The advertisement can...enable the viewer to ...increase or decrease the volume” on page 13, paragraph 6, line 4.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

The ramification of these references is that the specification describes that a human can “see and hear” the advertisement sounds that emanate from the “singing”, the “music video”, and the “volume” of the sounds that can be increased or decreased for hearing purposes.

The 5 Equivalent References to “an advertisement sound”:

1b. The first equivalent reference to an advertisement sound is the word “multimedia” which is written twice in the specification. The first “multimedia” is written in the “Background – Field of Invention” part of the specification. The second “multimedia” that is written in “ability to handle graphics, multimedia, and hypertext links” on page 8, paragraph 7, line 2.

2b. The second equivalent reference is the word “information” that is written 4 times in the specification: (1) on page 8, paragraph 5, line 7, (2) on page 12, paragraph 4, line 2, (3) on page 12, paragraph 5, line 3, (4) and on page 18, paragraph 1, line 10.

3b. The third equivalent reference is the words “advertising message” that is written 2 times in the specification: (1) on page 9, paragraph 7, line 2, (2) and on page 10, paragraph 3, line 2.

4b. The fourth equivalent reference is the words “advertisement’s message” written on page 11, paragraph 7, line 3.

5b. The fifth equivalent reference is the words “message” and “messages” that are written 8 times in the specification: (1) on page 2, paragraph 3, line 2, (2) on page 4, paragraph 6, line 2, (3) on page 8, paragraph 4, line 3, (4,5) on page 12, paragraph 4, lines 1 and 4, (6) on page 14, paragraph 5, line 3, (7) on page 18, paragraph 1, line 5, (8) on drawing Fig. 4, step 76, line 4.

The ramifications of these equivalent references is that the specification describes that a human “can view and hear” an “advertisement sound” because sounds are a form of “multimedia”, “information”, “advertising messages”, “message”, and “messages”. Furthermore a human may not hear internet advertising sounds of the claims because the volume is on “Ø”. Also the production of the internet advertising sounds may not have sounds by design, in which case the human hears “Ø” sounds from the internet advertising.

The 3 References to “the control” of an advertisement sound:

1c. The first reference to the control of an advertisement sound is the phrase “the ad door allows the viewer to control the advertisement after it is selected.” that is written on page 13, paragraph 6, line 1.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

The next sentence explains, “The advertisement can...enable the viewer to...increase or decrease the volume and other such functions.” and also constitutes the second reference.

2c. As mentioned the second reference is the phrase “increase or decrease the volume”, of an advertisement, that is written on page 13, paragraph 6, line 4.

3c. The third reference is the words “buttons and control knobs” that is written in the same previous phrase “The advertisement can be attached with buttons and control knobs that enable the view to pause, play,...increase or decrease the volume and other such functions.” on page 13, paragraph 6, line 2.

The ramification of these 3 references is that the specification describes “the control” of the advertisement sounds that a human “can view and **hear**”.

The applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable and solicits reconsideration and allowance under § 112 because the claim clearly complies with the enablement requirement.

The applicant requests reconsideration of the statement “As a result, dependent claims have been rejected.” and requests that the rejected dependent claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 be reinstated under 35 USC § 112.

The Rejection of Claim 2 Under § 112 Overcome

The O.A. states “Claims 2 and 5 recite the limitation “the internet of Claim (2 and 5)” in the first line of the claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.”

The applicant disagrees that there is insufficient antecedent basis in the first line of claim 2.

Claim 2 is canceled and replaced by new claim 7.

New claim 7 recites “The internet” with the proper antecedent because “internet advertising” is recited 4 times from referred independent claim 1. The antecedent “The” of new claim 7 refers to an aspect of “internet advertising” from claim 1 by using the different, but implicitly clear designation of “internet” from the aforementioned “internet advertising”.

New claim 7 amends canceled claim 2 in the following ways with the accompanying reasons:

1. The phrase “various existing internet networks, future generation internet networks, and” is deleted to make the claim clear, logical, and precise under § 112, second paragraph, and to broaden the claim in concise language under § 112.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

2. The step in the phrase “for blocking and revealing said internet advertising” is added to the end of claim 7 to make the claim recite a function under § 112, sixth paragraph.

The applicant submits that new claim 7 amends canceled claim 2 to distinctly claim the subject matter, and to make the claim clear and understandable and requests reconsideration. Therefore, the applicant solicits allowance of new claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Rejection of Claim 4 Under § 112 Overcome

The O.A states “Claim 4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claimed “entertaining manner” in which a non-advertising illustration removes itself is a subjective phrase that renders the claim indefinite.”

The applicant agrees that the recited “entertaining manner” is a subjective phrase. Claim 4 is rewritten by deleting the phrase “in an entertaining manner”.

The applicant thanks the Examiner for this perceptive insight.

Independent claim 4 is canceled and replaced by new independent claim 9.

New claim 9 amends claim 4 in the following ways with the accompanying reasons:

1. The word “contiguously” is deleted in the preamble to make claim 9 clear, logical and precise under § 112, second paragraph.
2. The word “providing” is deleted in step (a) to make claim 9 clear, logical and precise under § 112, second paragraph and to comply under § 112, sixth paragraph.
3. The phrase “or non-advertising moving illustration” is deleted in step (a) to make claim 9 clear and precise under § 112, second paragraph, and to broaden the claim in concise language under § 112.

The applicant submits that new independent claim 9 amends canceled independent claim 4 to distinctly claim the subject matter, and to make the claim clear and understandable and requests reconsideration. Therefore, the applicant solicits allowance of new claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Rejection of Claim 5 Under § 112 Overcome

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

As mentioned the O.A. states “Claims 2 and 5 recite the limitation “the internet of Claim (2 and 5)” in the first line of the claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.”

The applicant agrees part way that there is insufficient antecedent basis in the first line of claim 5.

Claim 5 recites “The internet” with the proper antecedent because “internet advertisement” is recited 4 times from referred independent claim 4, now new claim 9.

While the antecedent “The” of claim 5 refers to an aspect of “internet advertisement” from claim 4 (now new claim 9) by using the different, but implicitly clear designation of “internet”, the claim is amended to recite the more logical “The device”.

Claim 5 is canceled and replaced by new claim 10.

New claim 10 amends canceled claim 5 in the following ways with the accompanying reasons:

1. The words “The internet” is deleted and replaced by “The device” to make claim 10 logical under § 112, second paragraph.
2. The phrase “various existing internet networks, future generation internet networks, and” is deleted to make claim 10 clear, logical, and precise under § 112, second paragraph, and to broaden the claim in concise language under § 112.

The applicant submits that new claim 10 amends canceled claim 5 to distinctly claim the subject matter, and to make the claim clear and understandable and requests reconsideration. Therefore, the applicant solicits allowance of new claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Rejections of Claims 1, 3-4 and 6 on Cragun Overcome

Under § 102

The Office Action states “Claims 1, 3-4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cragun et al (US Patent 6,324,553), hereinafter Cragun.” Each rejected claim is discussed in the following headings.

A Review of the Invention of Cragun

The invention of Cragun shows an unmodified version of a document and a web browser that initially displays images and objects to view for a user. The user requests to selectively disable these images and objects from view to generate a modified document and modified web browser.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

The Rejection of Claim 1 on Cragun Overcome Under § 102

The O.A. states “Regarding claim 1, Applicant states on page 2 of the specification, “most internet advertisements come in the form of buttons or banners of various sizes with their messages exhibited by default”, in other words, most internet advertisements are sent to the user as images. Cragun discloses a method for the selective blocking of such images presented to a user through a web browser. Furthermore, Cragun teaches placing an image of a blocking nature of sufficient size to conceal an internet advertising space, taught as a browser displayed icon covering the location of where the image would have been, at col. 11, lines 45-49. Cragun also teaches using a selection method to choose and make the blocking image disappear and reveal the advertising, taught as the use of a pop-up dialog in response to a user action (at col. 16, lines 47-50) that allows the user to de-select images from a blocking list, at col. 13, lines 40-46, which allows a user to view selected images.”

Claim 1 is in original status.

The applicant respectfully disagrees that Cragun describes and anticipates the novel physical features of claim 1, as stated in the rejection, for the following reasons:

1. The applicant submits that page 2 of the applicant’s specification is not in regards to claim 1 at all. The sentence from page 2 is quoted, “Most internet advertisements come in the form of buttons or banners of various sizes with their messages exhibited by default.” This sentence is in the “Background--Description of Prior Art” part of the specification, and thus only describes the prior art background of claim 1.
2. Claim 1 recites placing images of a blocking nature of sufficient size to substantially conceal an internet advertising space. Cragun “discloses a method for the **selective blocking** of such images presented to a user through a web browser.”

Cragun does not describe and anticipate claim 1 because **each and every** internet advertising space of the claim is substantially concealed. Cragun describes that the blocking of the images in his invention is **selective**, and does not block each and every image. These novel physical features of claim 1 distinguish over Cragun.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

3. As mentioned Cragun discloses “a web browser.” Indeed Cragun describes numerous steps and parts that are **deeply embedded in web browsers, and in unmodified and modified documents.**

Thus claim 1 distinguishes over Cragun because the novel physical features and structure of the claim are recited **independent and apart** from web browsers and unmodified and modified documents.

4. As mentioned the O.A. states, “Furthermore, Cragun teaches placing an image of a blocking nature of sufficient size to conceal an internet advertising space, taught as a browser displayed icon covering the location where the image would have been, at col. 11, lines 45-49. “

The applicant disagrees that Cragun describes, anticipates and teaches placing an image of a blocking nature of sufficient size to conceal an internet advertising space of claim 1.

Instead Cragun describes at col. 11, lines 45-49, (without numbers), “Referring again to FIG. 7c, in response to the user’s request, browser displayed icon, indicating the location at which the image would have been placed had it not been blocked as further described below under the description for FIGS. 9a, 10, and 12.”

The images of claim 1 of placing images of a blocking nature of sufficient size to substantially conceal an internet advertising space, is the **first default step.**

As mentioned, Cragun describes at col. 11, lines 45-49, a browser displayed icon that blocked an image. Yet Cragun describes that the image blocked by the icon was **clearly displayed previously**, and was not blocked as the first default step.

Prior to lines 45-49, Cragun describes at lines 30-31, “browser will block the image with an icon”. Then Cragun describes at lines 41-44, “a display screen **after** blocking an image, according to the preferred embodiment. The user **previously** selected block option”. Cragun clearly describes that an image was displayed first, and then blocked in later steps.

Thus claim 1 recites novel physical features that distinguish over Cragun because placing the images of a blocking nature of the claim to substantially conceal an internet advertising space is **the first step**, rather than first displaying an image that is **later blocked** of Cragun.

5. The applicant disagrees that Cragun describes and anticipates claim 1 in the following O.A. statement, “Cragun also teaches using a selection method to choose and make the blocking

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

image disappear and reveal the advertising, taught as the use of a pop-up dialog in response to a user action (at col. 16, lines 47-50.”

Cragun describes at col. 16, lines 47-50, (without numbers), “When the user selects window with pointer application-blocking manager displays pop-up dialog, which contains options “block”, “hide”, and “configure blocking.”

Claim 1 recites a selection method to choose and make the blocking image or images disappear and reveal internet advertising.

Instead the user of Cragun must request and perform several, sometimes many steps to block the images, such as selecting an image, next selecting in a pop-up dialog the options block or hide, other menu options like configure blocking that displays another dialog with 6 more choices, and then perhaps selecting buttons or hotspots to display his modified document with the blocked images.

Thus claim 1 recites novel physical features that distinguish over Cragun because the selection method of the claim **directly** chooses the blocking image, rather than the **indirect, multi-step selecting devices** of Cragun to block the images.

6. The applicant disagrees that Cragun describes and anticipates claim 1 in the O.A. statement, “in response to a user action (at col. 16, lines 47-50) that allows the user to **de-select images** from a blocking list, at col. 13, lines 40-46, which allows a user to view selected images.”

Cragun describes at col. 13, lines 40-46 (without numbers), “The user can also remove entries from blocking list in which case the image associated with the image-URL that is removed will no longer be blocked or hidden. Such an example user interface is described above under the description for FIG.7b. Referring again to FIG. 9a, control then returns to block, as described above.”

As mentioned the images of claim 1 of placing images of a blocking nature of sufficient size to substantially conceal an internet advertising space, is the **first default step**.

Although Cragun describes at col. 13, lines 40-46, that a user can also remove entries from a blocking list in which case the image associated with the image-URL that is removed will no longer be blocked or hidden, he describes prior to col. 13 that the image was previously displayed first.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Cragun describes at col. 10, lines 38-39, "Image-URL contains the complete URL address of the image data that is to be blocked."

Cragun describes at col. 11, lines 8-11, "Because the user has selected "image" for the contents of match-level field, only the specific image file in image-URL field is to be blocked."

Thus Cragun clearly describes in his invention that an image was displayed first, then a user selects the image that is to be blocked, and then the image is no longer blocked in response to a user request.

Thus claim 1 recites novel physical features that distinguish over Cragun because placing the images of the claim to substantially conceal an internet advertising space is the first step, rather than Cragun's invention of first displaying an image that is blocked in later steps, and still later steps are required for the user to request to "de-select" the hitherto blocked images to be no longer blocked.

The Additional Novel Physical Features of Claim 1:

Claim 1 recites additional novel physical features that distinguish over Cragun for the following reasons:

7. Claim 1 is novel over Cragun because he does not describe and anticipate substantially concealing an internet advertising space with a blocking image, as the first default step, such that a human sees the blocking image or images first, and thus conveniently cannot view and hear the internet advertising of the claim.

Instead the images of Cragun are never blocked as the first default step, but are selectively blocked in later steps.

8. Since claim 1 recites internet advertising that is substantially concealed by blocking images as a first default step, this is novel over Cragun because all of his images on an unmodified document do not simultaneously block anything.

9. Claim 1 is novel over Cragun because the internet advertising of the claim is substantially concealed as the **first default step**.

Instead Cragun describes that every image which is selectively blocked in his invention are **all requested by a user**.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

As examples, Cragun describes in the summary of his invention, “The user selects an image that the user desires to be blocked.”, and at col. 12, lines 36-38 (without numbers), “Referring to FIG. 9a, there is illustrated the main logic of browser that responds to requests from the user.”

10. Cragun describes that the images of his invention are selectively blocked by user request, and thus **not all** of his images are blocked.

Claim 1 is novel over Cragun because he does not describe and anticipate that **all** the internet advertising of the claim is blocked.

11. Claim 1 is novel over Cragun because he does not describe that when a human selects a blocking image of the claim, the blocking image subsequently **disappear** to reveal internet advertising.

Instead Cragun describes images that are **only blocked, hidden, or modified** (in other steps) but he never describes and anticipates blocking images that disappear to reveal the internet advertising of claim 1.

12. Cragun does not describe and anticipate the **internet advertising** of claim 1 that substantially conceal by blocking images, as a first default step.

Instead Cragun describes **advertisements** once at col. 16, lines 37-50 (without numbers), “Referring to FIG. 14a, there is illustrated a pictorial representation of the interfaces used to control the operation in an alternative embodiment. In this embodiment, news and advertisements are presented to the user in multiple windows, and on display screen. A browser and application manager downloads from a server a document that contains control tags and data that describe the windows and their contents. The documents may be in any form, such a file or files, packets of data, or a data stream.

When the user selects window with pointer application-blocking manager displays pop-up dialog , which contains options “block”, “hide”, and “configure-blocking”.”

Cragun describes, regarding this advertisement, later in the same column at line 67 to the next col. 17, lines 1-4 (without numbers), “Referring again to FIG. 14b, in response to the user’s request, application-blocking manager displayed blocking window, indicating the location at which the window would have been placed had it not been blocked,”.

Cragun’s FIG. 14a draws an advertisement with the words “Play The Lottery”.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Cragun's FIG. 14b draws a blocking window in place of the "Play The Lottery" advertisement. Thus the advertisements of Cragun are adorned and deeply embedded with the numerous parts of a unmodified document, a modified document, a web browser, an application manager, another document containing control tags, another document containing data that describe the windows and their contents, interfaces with block, hide, configure-blocking, an application-blocking manager, and a displayed blocking window that blocks the advertisement after a request by a user, among many other parts.

Thus internet advertising that is substantially concealed with just the part of the **blocking images** of claim 1 are novel physical features that distinguish over Cragun because the advertisements of his invention are adorned and embedded with **numerous parts**.

13. Cragun does not describe and anticipate the internet **advertising** of claim 1. Instead Cragun draws an image in FIG. 7a that advertises "PLAY THE LOTTERY WIN \$10 MILLION!!", and as mentioned, draws an advertisement in FIG. 14a with the words "Play The Lottery". Cragun also describes "play the lottery" a few more times in his description.

Thus Cragun too specifically and narrowly describes **advertisements** only for **lotteries**. The lotteries, in the U.S.A at least, can only be run by a government. The internet advertising of claim 1 can be **any advertising**, for example, advertising from corporations to small businesses. Thus claim 1 distinguishes over Cragun and the specific, narrow lottery advertisements of his invention.

14. Claim 1 is novel over Cragun because he fails to describe and anticipate the blocking images of the claim that substantially conceal internet advertising that can be placed **anywhere on the internet**.

Instead the images of Cragun that are selectively blocked are a part of the numerous parts and steps that are deeply embedded in a **generated unmodified document** and a **web browser**.

Thus the invention of Cragun is built into a web browser, whereas the blocked internet advertising of claim 1 is recited independently of any web browser.

15. Cragun does not describe and anticipate the images of claim 1 that are **only of a blocking nature**.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Instead his invention at the request of a user **not only blocks images, but also hides** and does **“configure-blocking”** of the images, **among other options**. Cragun describes after a user requests to hide an image, the image area becomes a blank space.

Cragun describes configure-blocking at col. 10, lines 29-37 (without numbers), “when the user selects configure blocking option...browser has displayed the fields in blocking list that are available for the user to modify. These fields are image-URL, match level, match position, scope, and action. In addition, browser has displayed delay field, which applies globally to all records in blocking list.”

In addition, Cragun describes at col. 12, lines 49-51 (without numbers), “The user can request...a new page operation, an edit profile operation, or an exit operation.” to modify the images.

Thus claim 1 is novel over Cragun because the images of the claim are only of a blocking nature, rather than the many options of Cragun to block, hide, configure-blocking with the 6 field options, and the 3 operations to modify his images.

16. Cragun does not describe and anticipate the images of claim 1 that **only disappear** when directly selected.

Instead Cragun describes after a user requests the block option, the image is **replaced by a browser displayed icon**. As mentioned after the hide option is requested, the image is **replaced by a blank space**. When the “configure-blocking” option is requested, the user is presented with **6 more options and 3 operations** to modify the selected images.

Thus claim 1 is novel over Cragun because the images of the claim only disappear when selected, rather than the images of Cragun being replaced by a browser icon, a blank space, modified by the 6 “configure-blocking” options, and modified by the 3 operations.

17. Cragun does not describe and anticipate the images of claim 1 that substantially conceal only internet advertising.

Instead Cragun not only blocks images but also blocks, hides, and does “configure-blocking” on windows, application titles, window titles, and window classes via an “application-blocking manager” among other blocked parts, and lastly a “href” value part.

Cragun describes a “href” as, which a user can enter in a “scope” field, “When scope field has a value of “href”, both the image tag within and the surrounding HTML href tag will be blocked.”

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

and “The “href” tag provides the ability to hyperlink to another source or display an image in response to the user selecting a button or hotspot on the screen.” and “...while “href” in scope field directs browser to, in addition, block those images that would have been displayed only by selecting them via a hotspot on the display screen.”

Thus claim 1 is novel over Cragun because the images of the claim **only block internet advertising**, rather than Cragun’s invention in which **many parts are blocked or modified** such as images, windows, application titles, “href” blocking parts, and other blocked parts.

From the reasons discussed, the applicant submits that independent claim 1 clearly recites novel physical features that distinguish over Cragun.

Therefore applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over Cragun and solicits reconsideration and allowance under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

**Claim 1 Produces New and Unexpected Results and Hence
Is Unobvious and Patentable Over Cragun Under § 103**

These distinctions are submitted to be of patentable merit because the novel subject matter of claim 1 is unobvious over Cragun, or any modification thereof.

The new and unexpected results that flow from the novel structure of claim 1 are discussed in the following reasons:

Cost: Claim 1 is likely to be cheaper to build per se than Cragun because his invention is substantially larger with many more parts. Claim 1 comprises 2 steps, 3 parts, and 2 functions, with 4 drawing, and 1 flowchart that are inexpensive to build. The blocking images and the internet advertising of claim 1 are relatively cheap to build.

The low cost to build result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention shows the very large generated modifiable documents and web browser programs. Cragun’s invention adds a large number of steps, parts and functions, with 30 drawings and 14 detailed flowcharts that is likely to be more expensive to build than claim 1.

From another perspective, claim 1 will likely to be free to use, as is customary of advertising in general. The free cost to use result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention is embedded in generated modifiable documents and web browsers. These products and services of Cragun typically have a cost to use that is passed to the consumer in several ways, and

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

although the cost is likely not too expensive it is very significant compared to the free use of the internet advertising of claim 1.

Size: Claim 1 per se is substantially smaller in size than Cragun, and the smaller size of the claim is a benefit.

The size benefit result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because the internet advertising of the claim makes sending the advertising over the internet easy, and has the added benefit of making the packaging of claim 1 unnecessary for distribution, for example, to consumers and retail stores.

Cragun's invention is substantially larger in size than claim 1, and is much slower and difficult to send over the internet, and web browser software is also typically packaged for distribution to consumers and retail stores. Thus the large size of Cragun's invention results in much less benefits than claim 1.

Speed: Claim 1 is able to do a job faster than Cragun, and such change in speed from the claim is a benefit because substantially concealing internet advertising is a first default step and takes up no time for a consumer. Also claim 1 is very fast because it requires merely selecting the blocking images to reveal the internet advertising. The speed advantage of claim 1 is important in internet claims.

This speed result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his results of viewable images displayed on an unmodified documents and the selective blocking and modifying of the images requires a series of steps that makes it substantially slower than claim 1.

The steps of Cragun, for example, require the user to request to block images by selecting the images, selecting menu options in dialogs such as block, hide, configure-blocking, and modifying a blocking list by entering data into 6 fields, among other steps.

Ease of Use: Claim 1 is easier to use and learn than Cragun because the claim merely requires selecting the images that block the internet advertising to reveal the advertising. This advantage is especially important for a software innovation because it enables a human to use the computer more facilely, and this counts a great deal.

The ease of use result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention is significantly harder to use and learn. Cragun's invention requires the user to select images to

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

block from view, select menu options in dialogs such as block, hide, configure-blocking, further modifying a blocking list by entering data into 6 fields. These fields of Cragun require hard-to-type URL addresses to be entered, among many other steps.

Ease of Production: Claim 1 is likely to be easier to manufacture than Cragun because the claim requires instructions from 1 basic flowchart to build.

The ease of production result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because 14 detailed flowcharts and a rather long description are needed to build his invention. Cragun shows many steps and parts such as modifiable documents, web browsers, control tags, blocking lists, blank spaces, addresses, directories, dialogs, menus, fields, 6 specific operations, and an application-blocking manager to name a few. Cragun wrote a long description of instructions to build his invention. Thus Cragun's invention is likely harder to manufacture than claim 1.

Novelty: Claim 1 is different than Cragun and all previously known counterparts as of the applicant's filing date. Claim 1 is novel because the internet advertising is substantially concealed by blocking images such that a human can view and hear the internet advertising by selecting the blocking images that disappear.

The novelty result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because a user of his invention first views the displayed images on an unmodified document and later requests to block, among other functions, the images to a modified document.

Convenience: Claim 1 makes living easier and more convenient because substantially concealing internet advertising allows people to take the prerogative to view and hear the internet advertising. Claim 1 is convenient because merely selecting the blocking images reveals the internet advertising. Claim 1 makes living easier because the substantially concealed internet advertising reduces the often distracting visual clutter from advertisements that are viewable right away on the internet.

The substantially concealed internet advertising of claim 1 is convenient to producers because the selected internet advertising, after the blocking images disappear, garners the full and undivided attention of people. Thus the sparseness and simplicity of claim 1 is convenient for both the internet advertising audience and the internet advertising producers.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

These convenience results of claim 1 are very different than Cragun because his bewildering array of parts and steps fails to be convenient for a user.

Social Benefit: Claim 1 produces a social benefit because it blocks internet advertising for people who don't like commercial advertising. The social benefit result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because all of his unmodified images are viewable right away and simultaneously do not block anything.

Mechanization: Claim 1 provides a mechanization benefit because merely selecting a blocking image that then disappears is computerized and saves more time than Cragun's invention. The computerization result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because the many steps in his invention produces significantly longer computerization results that take significantly more time for a user to benefit.

Salability: Claim 1 is easier to sell and to market than Cragun and existing counterparts because of the unique and surprising result, which did not exist as of the applicant's filing date, of substantially concealing internet advertising as the first default step. The internet advertising of claim 1 applies to the vast internet market.

The salability result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention is built into modifiable documents and deeply embedded into web browsers, and that makes it hard to sell in these markets, and especially the very limited web browser market.

Appearance: Claim 1 provides a better appearing design than Cragun because his invention shows the "block" option that a user requests, and the viewable image is replaced by a "browser displayed icon". For another significant example, when a user requests the "hide" option, the viewable image is replaced by a "blank space".

The appearance result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because both the blocking images and the internet advertising of the claim has a better appearing design than the "browser displayed icon" and the "blank space" provided by Cragun.

Market Size: Claim 1 is likely to have a larger market size than Cragun because the internet advertising of the claim applies to the entire internet advertising market, and this is a huge advantage. The larger market size result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

invention is built into large, unwieldy modifiable documents, and is deeply embedded into web browsers and the markets for these are small.

Ease of Market Penetration: Claim 1 is an improvement of previous internet advertising because the internet advertising of the claim is substantially concealed as the first default step. Claim 1 will potentially have an easier time penetrating the market and obtaining a good market share than an invention that provides a completely new function.

The ease of market penetration result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention provides the new functions of selectively blocking, hiding and modifying images on a large, unwieldy modifiable document, and are embedded into a large web browser. Thus Cragun's invention is likely difficult to penetrate the market.

Potential Competition: Since claim 1 likely is so simple and easy to manufacture, that many imitators and copiers are likely to attempt to copy it, and design around it, and try to break the patent as soon as it is brought out. This competition result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention is relatively complex, harder to manufacture, and has some awkward methods and results, that it is not likely to be imitated or copied.

Excitement: Claim 1 is likely to provide consumer excitement because, either through sheer newness or through evidence of a costly purchase for status seekers, virtually all products and services can be advertised in the internet advertising. Claim 1 also has the element of surprise that adds to the excitement because the product or service in the blocked internet advertising is not known until it is selected. These excitement results of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because a user of his invention requests to selectively block, hide, and modify unwanted images and this results in hardly any excitement.

Markup: Since claim 1 is in an excitement category, it can command a very high markup which is a distinct selling advantage. This markup result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention is not in an excitement category.

Inferior Performance: Claim 1 places images of a blocking nature of sufficient size to substantially conceal an internet advertising space. These images of a blocking nature of claim 1 may perform worse than comparable internet images already available. Thus claim 1 has discovered a new use for inferior internet images, and puts it to proper use. These inferior

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

internet images of a blocking nature of claim 1 disappear when selected, and this can be a great advantage. This inferior performance result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention is meant to display a superior, custom-tailored modified document for a user, and to produce a superior performing web browser.

New Use: Claim 1 has discovered a new use for the images of the claim. The images of claim 1 are used to produce the new and unexpected result of substantially concealing internet advertising as a first default step. A human sees these images of a blocking nature first and by selecting the images, the human can view and hear the internet advertising. This new use result for images of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention fails to show the new use.

“Sexy” Packaging: Claim 1 is able to come in a “sexy” package or is adaptable to being sold in such a package because the blocking images can show sex appeal. For example, the blocking images are pictures with a tropical getaway theme replete with scantily clad models. In addition the products and services being advertised in the revealed internet advertising of claim 1 can also have sex appeal, and this can be a great advantage. The “sexy” results of claim 1 are very different than Cragun because his invention, on user request, actually blocks, hides, and modifies images deemed “sexy”, and thus his invention can only lessen the sex appeal result of the images.

Miscellaneous: Claim 1 takes the natural curious nature of humans, makes it an advantage because the internet advertising is substantially concealed as the first default step. To satiate the curiosity, the images substantially concealing the internet advertising must be selected to reveal the unknown internet advertising. This curiosity result produced by claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention first displays all images on an unmodified document, and only later selectively blocks, hides, and modifies the images. Thus Cragun fails to produce any of the advantageous curiosity results of claim 1.

Related Product Addability: Claim 1 will likely usher in new product lines because the internet advertising can advertise virtually any product and service, where many new related products and services of them can be added. This will be an important advantage of claim 1 with potentially enhanced profits. The addability results of claim 1 is very different than Cragun

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

because his invention is so specific, narrow and deeply embedded in modifiable documents and web browsers that it has very limited ability to add related products.

Operability: Claim 1 is likely to work readily, and no significant additional design and technical development is required to make it practicable and workable because of the small number steps and parts to make the claim operable. This operability result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention is so complex, specific and narrow with its many steps, parts, options and methods. Thus Cragun needs significant additional design and technical development that it has a limited, less operability result than claim 1.

Development: Claim 1 is already designed for the market and minimal appearance work will likely be required because the claim requires only 2 steps, 3 parts, and 2 functions. This development result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention is so complex, specific, and narrow with the 14 detailed flowcharts to help build it, that it requires significant development work. In addition Cragun's invention is not very useful as designed and is unlikely to have a big market.

Profitability: Claim 1 is likely to sell at a profit or at an acceptable price level because there are minimal requirements for exotic materials, difficult machining steps, or great size. The potential profitability result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention requires the large generated unmodified documents, the relatively difficult construction steps, and the great size of web browsers. These requirements of Cragun and the fact that the market of large, unwieldy modifiable documents and web browsers is small, make it unlikely that his invention will sell at a profit, and likely is a limited profitability result.

Obsolescence: The field in which claim 1 is used, website multimedia design and development, is likely to be around for a long time because websites are a popular and growing field. This positive obsolescence result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because, while its field of improved information processing systems is likely to be around for a long time, his invention for managing the display of images on a screen is not very useful. Thus Cragun's invention is unlikely to be around for a long time, and has uncertain obsolescence results.

Ease of Distribution: Claim 1 per se is easy to distribute because the internet advertising is a small digital creation that is very easily sent over the internet. The small size of claim 1 makes

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

other conventional distribution options unnecessary. This ease of distribution result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because the generated documents and the web browsers of his invention are substantially larger. Cragun's invention takes longer to distribute, such as over the internet, to consumers, to retail stores, and thus is significantly more difficult to distribute.

Production Facilities: Almost all inventions require new production facilities, a distinct disadvantage. This is because the manufacture of anything new requires new tooling and production techniques. However claim 1 requires only a modest change or no change in new production facilities, a tremendous advantage. This production result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention has so many steps and parts that are programmed into the already complex and huge web browser software and generated modifiable documents. Thus the invention of Cragun results in a substantially larger change than claim 1 in production facilities and techniques.

Minor Technical Advance: Claim 1 is a minor technical advance and can be commercially implemented within about 17 years. The minor technical advance result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention is a greater technical advance than claim 1 with its many complex steps, parts, options and methods.

Minimal Learning Required: People will have to undergo minimal or no learning in order to use claim 1 because merely selecting the blocking images reveals the internet advertising, and this is a strong advantage. The minimal learning result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention is significantly more complex than claim 1 that it requires substantial learning to use. The user of Cragun is likely to need significant time, trial and error, and learning to use his invention, and thus he shows a substantial learning result which is not an advantage.

Easy to Promote: The internet advertising of claim 1 is cheap and easy to market because the internet advertising is very visible and is generally free to the consumer. The easy to promote result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention is large, technically complex with many hidden parts, and is not very useful that makes it difficult to promote.

Presence of Market: Claim 1 has a market that already exists in the internet advertising market. The presence of market result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his complex

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

invention is built into generated modifiable documents and web browsers. The market for these is relatively small and indicates a lack of market result of Cragun.

Combination Product: Claim 1 is a combination product because the two functions of blocking images that disappear and the revealed internet advertising groove well together because a human views and hears the internet advertising only if he or she wants. The combination product result of claim 1 is foreign to Cragun because the functions that are combined in his invention such as block, hide with the browser displayed icons and blank spaces to produce modified images on a modified document are completely different than the combination of claim 1.

Broad Patent Coverage Available: If broad patent coverage is obtained for claim 1, this will affect profitability because the claim is the only source which performs its certain functions. This potential broad coverage allows the capability to charge more than if claim 1 were in a competitive situation.

High Sales Anticipated: Claim 1 can anticipate a high sales volume because the substantially concealed internet advertising of the claim is simple, cheap, and easy to market. The potential high sales result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention is so much more complex and expensive. The generated modifiable documents and web browser markets on which Cragun's invention depend is small and this makes it even harder to market, so that high sales are unlikely.

Visibility of Invention in Final Product: Claim 1 is highly visible and essentially constitutes the entire final product because both the blocking images and the internet advertising parts are viewable. This high visibility of claim 1 will be a distinct marketing advantage to entice buyers who love the new. The visibility result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because many parts of his invention are not visible. Furthermore Cragun's invention is actually meant to reduce the visibility of images by replacing them with browser displayed icons and blank spaces, for example. These results of Cragun do not show high visibility and his visible parts do not constitute the entire final product of his invention.

Ease of Packaging: Claim 1 is easy to package because the substantially concealed internet advertising is easily sent over the internet. The small size of claim 1 makes packaging it for

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

delivery to consumers and retail stores, for example, unnecessary. Since there is practically no packaging of claim 1, this will be a great aid in marketing. The ease of packaging result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention is large and needs packaging in addition to sending it over the internet. Thus Cragun's invention is significantly more difficult to package than claim 1.

Youth Market: Young people have substantial discretionary income and tend to spend more in many product areas than the rest of the population. Since the internet advertising claim 1 can advertise virtually anything, this includes products aimed for the youth market. Claim 1 has the surprise factor that will likely be popular with this age group because the internet advertising is first blocked and only by selecting the blocking images will the advertised product be known. In addition the blocking images can be presented in many ways, including material that is meant to be fun, entertaining, and dramatic that piques young people's curiosity. Thus the internet advertising of claim 1 may command more sales than something that is not attractive to this age group like Cragun's invention. The youth market result of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his invention of selectively blocking, hiding, and modifying images with complex steps is probably boring for young people, and thus likely has a much smaller youth market.

Claim 1 Is Unobvious Over Cragun Under § 103 for the

Following Additional Reasons:

These distinctions are submitted to be of patentable merit under § 103 because of the new and unexpected results that flow from the novel structure of claim 1.

The additional reasons that claim 1 is unobvious are as follows:

Synergism: The results achieved by claim 1 are greater than the sum of the separate results of its parts. Claim 1 produces the results of internet advertising that is revealed when a human chooses to, and this is much more than the separate results of the blocking images, a selection method, and the internet advertising parts.

In addition, the combination of claim 1 of the blocking images that disappear when selected, and the revealed the internet advertising cooperate to increase the overall effectiveness of the advertising because it garners the full and undivided attention of a human, a synergistic effect.

These synergism results of claim 1 is very different than Cragun because his results of

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

selectively blocking, hiding, configure-blocking, and modifying images are smaller than the sum of the numerous steps and parts, such as a web browser, of his invention. Cragun's invention does not increase the overall effectiveness of managing the display of images on a screen because the many managing steps are relatively difficult to learn to use.

Different Combination: The combination of claim 1 had not been previously created as of the applicant's filing date.

In addition, the combination of claim 1 of blocking images, a selection method, the revealing of the internet advertising when a human chooses to, is very different than the combination of Cragun. Cragun shows the different combinations of a generated unmodified document with images on display, a web browser with numerous embedded parts, and the selective blocking, hiding, configure-blocking and modifying of images.

Unexpected Results: The results achieved by claim 1 are new, unexpected, superior, disproportionate, unsuggested, unusual, critical and surprising because its blocking images substantially conceal the internet advertising as the first default step. The invention of Cragun first displays images on an unmodified document and these images do not substantially conceal any internet advertising, much less block anything.

Assumed Insolubility: Claim 1 has the potential to solve a problem that is insoluble. Claim 1 converts failure into success because it solves the problem of relatively low revenue from internet advertising. Since a human chooses to view and hear the internet advertising of claim 1, the advertising garners the person's full and undivided attention. Thus the advertising of claim 1 has more value than prior art internet advertising that a human may or may not be paying attention to, much less having the advantage of being selected. The failure of the prior art to produce significant internet advertising revenue equal to other media, indicates that a solution was not unobvious. Cragun's invention displays images displayed on an unmodified document that are later selectively blocked, and does not solve the problem of relatively low internet advertising revenue.

Crowded Art: Claim 1 is classified in the crowded art of the internet. Therefore a small step forward should be regarded as significant because claim 1 presents substantially conceal internet advertising as a first default step. Cragun fails to show this small step forward of claim 1, and

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

instead his invention shows many steps and parts to produce a large step forward in a cumbersome system and method that heavily uses a large-sized web browser, and also the large generated modifiable documents.

Omission of Elements: Cragun describes and shows numerous elements that are omitted in claim 1 such as 14 detailed flowcharts, unmodified document, web browser, application manager, control tags, interface dialogs showing menu options block and hide and configure-blocking, entries, blocking lists, input fields, image-URL field, match level field, match position field, scope field, action field, delay field, location field, match-to-position field, directories, href value, href tag, browser displayed icons, blank spaces, data structures, blocking records, a new page operation, an edit-profile operation, an exit operation, hotspot function, bookmark entry function, true determinations, false determinations, default values, application-blocking manager, application title, window title, window class, next-pointer field, previous-pointer field, window-caption field, window-class field, current-handle field, parent-application field, parent-chain field, blocker-window field, blocking-active field, an application-blocking list management operation, a window to foreground operation, a destroy window operation, the z-order, the maximum z-order, generated unmodified version documents, a saving user selection for subsequent use function, generated modified version documents, and a blocking the display of all images function, among other elements.

Unsuggested Modifications: Cragun lacks any suggestion that his invention should be modified in the following manners required to meet claim 1 because of the following reasons:

(1) The O.A. states “Furthermore, Cragun teaches placing an image of a blocking nature of sufficient size to conceal an internet advertising space, taught as a browser displayed icon covering the location of where the image would have been, at col. 11, lines 45-49.”

Cragun, at col. 11, lines 45-49, does not teach placing images of a blocking nature of sufficient size to substantially conceal an internet advertising space.

Instead Cragun teaches, in part, at col. 11, lines 45-49 (without numbers), “in response to the user’s request, browser displayed icon, indicating the location at which the image would have been placed had it not been blocked as further described below...”

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Thus Cragun teaches that the image **blocked by a browser displayed icon** is in response after the user's request. This result of Cragun is very different than claim 1 because the blocking images of the claim are **not blocked, but instead disappear** when selected.

Therefore Cragun at col. 11, lines 45-49, lacks any suggestion that it should be modified in a manner required to meet claim 1.

(2) The O.A. states "Cragun also teaches using a selection method to choose and make the blocking image disappear and reveal the advertising, taught as the use of a pop-up dialog in response to a user action (at col. 16, lines 47-50)..." .

Cragun, at col. 16, lines 47-50, does not teach using a selection method to choose and make the blocking images disappear and reveal the internet advertising.

Instead Cragun teaches, at col. 16, lines 47-50 (without numbers), "When the user selects window with pointer application-blocking manager displays pop-up dialog, which contains options "block", "hide", and "configure blocking"."

Thus Cragun teaches when the user selects a window, a pop-up dialog is displayed with options **block, hide, and configure-blocking**. These three options of Cragun are very different than claim 1 because the images of the claim **only block** the internet advertising as the first default step.

In addition Cragun, at col. 16, lines 47-50, does not teach any blocking images that **disappear** and this is very different than claim 1 because the blocking images of the claim **disappear** when selected.

Therefore Cragun at col. 16, lines 47-50, lacks any suggestion that it should be modified in a manner required to meet claim 1.

(3) The O.A. states, in part, "Cragun also teaches using a selection method to choose and make the blocking image disappear and reveal the advertising...that allows the user to de-select images from a block list, at col. 13, lines 40-46, which allows a user to view selected images."

Cragun does not teach using a selection method to choose and make the blocking images disappear and reveal the internet advertising, by allowing the user to de-select images from a block list which allows a user to view selected images.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

In fact, Cragun does not teach any functions that “**de-select** images” from a blocking list anywhere in his invention.

Instead Cragun teaches, at col. 13, lines 40-46 (without numbers), “The user can also remove entries from blocking list in which case the image associated with the image-URL that is removed will no longer be blocked or hidden. Such an example user interface is described above under the description for FIG. 7b. Referring again to FIG. 9a, control then returns to block, as described above.”

Also Cragun teaches, in part, in the sentence before lines 40-46, in lines 36-40, (without numbers), “FIG. 9a, at block, browser displays the contents of blocking list to the user and updates the user-entered fields into blocking list, as further described below...”.

This result of Cragun is very different than claim 1 because the internet advertising of the claim is substantially concealed with blocking images as the **first default step**, and is only **revealed** when a human selects the blocking images.

Rather Cragun teaches that the image that is no longer blocked or hidden was “user-entered” into a blocking list in lines 36-40, and as a result he teaches that the no longer blocked or hidden image was displayed on view in an **earlier step** in his invention.

Therefore Cragun at col. 13, lines 40-46, lacks any suggestion that it should be modified in a manner required to meet claim 1.

(4) As mentioned the O.A. states, in part, “Cragun also teaches using a selection method to...reveal the advertising, taught as the use of a pop-up dialog in response to a user action (at col. 16, lines 47-50 that allows the user to de-select images from a block list, at col. 13, lines 40-46, which allows a user to view selected images.”

What Cragun teaches at col. 16, lines 47-50 and at col. 13, lines 40-46 are quoted in the above subheadings (2) and (3).

Cragun at col. 16, lines 47-50 and at col. 13, lines 40-46, does not teach the function of “reveal the advertising”. Instead Cragun teaches a user requests to block, hide, configure-blocking images, and also teaches that a user can remove entries from blocking list so that blocked or hidden images are no longer blocked or hidden.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Cragun, in the two quotes, does not teach internet advertising that is revealed nor elsewhere in his invention at all. Claim 1 is very different than Cragun because the internet advertising of the claim is substantially concealed as a first default step and is **revealed** when a human chooses to. Therefore Cragun at col. 16, lines 47-50 and at col. 13, lines 40-46, lacks any suggestion that it should be modified in a manner required to meet claim 1.

Unappreciated Advantages: As of the applicant's filing date, Cragun and those skilled in the art never appreciated the advantages of claim 1 although it is inherent. Claim 1 blocks the internet advertising as the first default step, and has the advantages of using curiosity, surprise, and garnering the full and undivided attention of a human when he or she chooses to reveal the internet advertising, which creates the advantage of a higher value for such internet advertising.

Poor Reference: Claim 1 is foreign to Cragun because all images of his invention are originally displayed on an unmodified document and are only later blocked on user request. Cragun's images also do not substantially conceal any internet advertising.

Hence Cragun's invention conflicts with claim 1 because the blocking images of the claim disappear when selected to reveal the internet advertising. Cragun's invention is a poor reference because it is foreign and conflicting to claim 1, and therefore is weak and should be construed narrowly.

Lack of Implementation: If claim 1 were in fact obvious, because of its advantages, Cragun and those skilled in the art surely would have implemented it the applicant's filing date. The fact that Cragun and those skilled in the art have not implemented claim 1, despite its great advantages, indicates that it is not obvious.

Misunderstood Reference: Cragun does not teach what the O.A. relies upon it as supposedly teaching because his invention does not show the results of claim 1 of substantially concealing internet advertising as the first default step with blocking images that disappear when selected. Instead Cragun teaches displaying an unmodified document with viewable images that a user later requests to block, hide, configure-blocking, and modify to produce a modified document. Cragun also does not teach the selection method of claim 1 of directly choosing the blocking images of the claim, and instead teaches the indirect selecting and modifying of his images.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Cragun also does not teach the substantially concealed internet advertising of claim 1 that is revealed when the blocking images are selected.

Solution of Long-Felt and Unsolved Need: Claim 1 provides a solution to long-felt, long-existing, but unsolved need because claim 1 solves the need to generate significant revenue from internet advertising. Since a human chooses to select the blocked internet advertising of claim 1, his or her attention is full and undivided and this provides a higher value for such advertising. Cragun's invention does not solve the need to generate significant advertising revenue at all.

Contrarian Invention: Claim 1 is contrary to the teachings of Cragun because the internet advertising of the claim is blocked as the first default step. Claim 1 goes against the grain of what Cragun teaches because his invention first generates an unmodified document displaying images that a user later requests to block, hide, configure-blocking, and modify.

Strained Interpretations: The O.A. has made a strained interpretation of Cragun that could be made only by hindsight because Cragun does not show the results of claim 1 of blocking images that substantially conceal internet advertising, and does not show blocked internet advertising that is revealed when a human wants to.

New Principle of Operation: Claim 1 utilizes a new principle of operation because its internet advertising is substantially concealed as a first default step. Prior art advertising, by first being shown as usual, gets exposure to as large an audience as possible. Cragun does not show this new principle of operation of claim 1. Applicant has blazed a trail, rather than followed one.

Solves Different Problem: Claim 1 solves a different problem than Cragun, and such different problem is recited in the claim. Claim 1 solves the problem of generating significant internet advertising revenue by revealing internet advertising when a human wants to. Cragun's invention solves the very different problem of managing the display of images on a screen by generating an unmodified version of a document with displayed images that a user later requests to modify in many ways.

No Convincing Reasoning: The O.A. has not presented a convincing line of reasoning as to why the claimed subject matter as a whole of claim 1, including its differences over Cragun, would have been obvious. Cragun clearly does not show the new and unexpected results of claim 1 as discussed above. For a prime example, Cragun does not show the images of a

blocking nature that substantially conceal the internet advertising as a first default step of claim

1. For another prime example, Cragun does not show the revealing of the internet advertising when a human directly selects the blocking images that subsequently disappear.

From the reasons discussed, the applicant submits that independent claim 1 produces valuable new, unexpected, and different results and hence is unobvious and patentable over Cragun under 35 U.S.C § 103.

Accordingly, the applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over Cragun and solicits reconsideration and allowance.

Claim 3, Now New Dependent Claim 8, Is A Fortiori Patentable Over Cragun

The new dependent claim 8 incorporates all the subject matter of independent claim 1 and adds additional subject matter which makes the claim a fortiori and independently patentable over Cragun.

Claim 3 is canceled and is replaced by new claim 8.

New claim 8 is rewritten for reasons that include those discussed above for referred independent claim 1 in the heading “The Rejection of Claim 1 Under § 112 Overcome”.

New claim 8 amends canceled claim 3 in the following ways with the accompanying reasons:

1. The phrase “methods like a mouse click method,” is deleted to make the claim clear, logical, and precise under § 112, second paragraph, and to broaden the claim in concise language under § 112.
2. The phrase “keyboard keys or “ is deleted to make the claim clear, logical, and precise under § 112, second paragraph, and to broaden the claim in concise language under § 112.
3. The phrase “, a touch-screen method, a stylus method, and a voice recognition method.” is deleted to make the claim clear, logical, and precise under § 112, second paragraph, and to broaden the claim in concise language under § 112.
4. The step in the phrase “to choose and make said blocking image or images disappear.” is added to the end of claim 8 to make the claim recite a function under § 112, sixth paragraph. The applicant submits that new claim 8 amends canceled claim 3 to distinctly claim the subject matter, and to make the claim clear and understandable and requests reconsideration.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Therefore, the applicant solicits allowance of new claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Rejection of Claim 3, Now New Claim 8, on Cragun

Overcome Under § 102

The O.A. states, “Regarding claim 3, Cragun teaches a selection method using any manner of pointing device (embodied in the disclosure as a mouse), or combination of devices, including a keyboard, at col. 16, lines 50-54. The claimed touch-screen, stylus, and voice recognition are well known input methods.”

Cragun describes at col. 16, lines 50-54 (without numbers), “In an alternative embodiment, the user could select window with any manner of pointing device, or a combination of pointing devices, or a combination of a pointing device and keyboard.”

As mentioned claim 3 is canceled and is replaced by new claim 8.

New claim 8 is novel over Cragun for reasons that include those discussed above for referred independent claim 1 in the heading “The Rejection of Claim 1 on Cragun Overcome Under § 102”.

The applicant respectfully disagrees that Cragun describes and anticipates the novel physical features of new claim 8.

Claim 8 is novel over Cragun because the selection feature of the claim is a **method** of selection. Instead Cragun describes at col. 16, lines 50-54, “with any manner of pointing device, or a combination of pointing devices, or a combination of a pointing device and keyboard.”

Thus Cragun describes a user of his invention could select using various **devices**, and never describes a keys method of claim 8.

The applicant submits that claim 8 clearly recites the novel physical feature of a keys **method** of selection that distinguishes over Cragun because his invention only describes various pointing **devices**.

As mentioned the O.A. states, “The claimed touch-screen, stylus, and voice recognition are well known input methods.”. As discussed above, these elements are deleted to make the claim clear, logical, and precise under § 112, second paragraph, and to broaden the claim in concise language under § 112.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

From the reasons discussed, the applicant submits that new claim 8 clearly recites novel physical features that distinguish over MacMillan.

Therefore applicant submits that new claim 8 is allowable over Cragun and solicits reconsideration and allowance under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

New Claim 8 Produces New and Unexpected Results and Hence Is Unobvious and Patentable Over Cragun Under § 103

These distinctions are submitted to be of patentable merit because the novel subject matter of new claim 8 is unobvious and hence even more patentable under § 103 since it adds additional subject matter over Cragun, or any modification thereof.

The new and unexpected results for new claim 8 include those discussed for claim 1 above in the heading “Claim 1 Produces New and Unexpected Results and Hence Is Unobvious and Patentable Over Cragun Under § 103”.

The new and unexpected results that flow from the novel structure of new claim 8 are discussed in the following reasons:

Salability: Claim 8 likely is easier to sell and market than Cragun because a keys method of selection applies to the many selection methods using keys available on the market. This salability result of claim 8 is very different than Cragun because his pointing devices or any manner of pointing device does not show the many other parts that interact to make a selection method work. To cover these many unnamed interacting parts such as springs, circuits, wires, transistors, light emitting mechanisms, and the different software programs involved the keys method of claim 8 is an advantage and will likely produce more salability results than Cragun.

Market Size: There is a larger potential market for claim 8 than for Cragun because the keys method of selection of the claim covers more selection systems than Cragun’s various, more limited pointing devices. The large potential market size result of claim 8 is a significant advantage that is very different than Cragun and his likely smaller market size.

New Use: Claim 8 has discovered a new use for the keys method of selection of claim 8. The keys method is used to choose and make the blocking images disappear to reveal the internet advertising of claim 8. This new use result of claim 8 is very different than Cragun because his

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

invention fails to show the new use of making blocking images disappear to reveal internet advertising.

Long Life Cycle: Claim 8 has a potentially long life cycle because a keys method of selection can be made and sold for many years and this is a strong advantage. The potential long life cycle result of claim 8 is very different than Cragun because his various pointing devices may become obsolete as is the case for many machines.

Related Product Addability: Claim 8 will likely usher in new product lines where many related products having a keys method of selection can be added. This will be an important advantage with potentially enhanced profits. The addability result of claim 8 is very different than Cragun because his invention shows any manner and combination of pointing devices, which leaves no room to add new product lines to such pointing devices.

Operability: Claim 8 is likely to work readily to make it practicable and workable because a keys method of selection requires no significant design and technical development that is the usual case for most simple methods. The operability result of claim 8 is very different than Cragun because his various pointing devices need many additional parts to work readily. Thus Cragun's invention has less operability results than claim 8.

New Claim 8 Is Unobvious Over Cragun Under § 103 for the

Following Additional Reasons:

The reasons that new claim 8 is unobvious include those for claim 1 discussed above in the heading "Claim 1 is Unobvious Over Cragun for the Following Additional Reasons:".

The additional reasons that claim 2 is unobvious are as follows:

Different Combination: Claim 8 shows the combination of a keys method, and directly choosing blocking images with the keys method, and the disappearing blocking images. This combination of claim 8 hadn't previously created as of the applicant's filing date.

Cragun shows a combination of various pointing devices, the indirect selecting of images, and the images that a user requests to block, hide, configure-blocking, and further modify with additional options. Cragun's combination is so far different than claim 8 that his combination must be regarded as different from that of claim 8.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Unexpected Results: The results achieved by claim 8 are new, unexpected, superior, disproportionate, unsuggested, unusual, critical and surprising because a keys method directly chooses to make the blocking images disappear. Cragun fails to show these results of claim 8. Instead Cragun's invention shows images are blocked or hidden by browser displayed icons or blank spaces respectively when selected by various pointing devices, among his other options. Furthermore Cragun's images do not block anything, and do not disappear by themselves when directly selected.

Omission of Elements: The elements of Cragun's invention of a pointing device of any manner, a combination of pointing devices, and a combination of a pointing device and keyboard are omitted in claim 8.

Unsuggested Modification:

Cragun lacks any suggestion that his invention should be modified in a manner required to meet claim 8 because he only describes and shows the various pointing **devices** and not **methods** of selection of claim 8, much less a keys method.

The O.A. states "Regarding claim 3, Cragun teaches a selection method using any manner of pointing device (embodied in the disclosure as a mouse), or combination of devices, including a keyboard, at col. 16, lines 50-54."

Instead Cragun describes at col. 16, lines 50-54, "In an alternative embodiment, the user could select window with any manner of pointing device, or a combination of pointing devices, or a combination of a pointing device and keyboard."

Therefore Cragun at col. 16, lines 50-54, clearly lacks any suggestion that it should be modified in a manner required to meet claim 8.

Misunderstood Reference: Cragun does not teach what the O.A. relies upon it as supposedly teaching because Cragun does not teach at col. 16, lines 50-54, any selection methods such as a keys method of claim 8. Cragun instead teaches a user could select with the various pointing devices of his invention that is very different than the methods of selection of claim 8.

Contrarian Invention: Claim 8 is contrary to the teachings of Cragun. Claim 8 goes against the grain of what Cragun teaches because a user of his invention selects using devices rather than using a method of selection of claim 8, such as a keys method.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Solved Different Problem: Claim 8 solves a different problem than Cragun, and such different problem is recited in claim 8. The key method of claim 8 is used to solve the problem of choosing and making the blocking images of the claim disappear. Cragun's images do not block anything and do not disappear. Rather Cragun's various pointing devices solve the very different problem of blocking, hiding, configure-blocking, and modifying images that replace the images with such functions as browser displayed icons, blank spaces, and other options. From the reasons discussed, the applicant submits new claim 8 produces valuable new, unexpected, and different results and hence is unobvious and patentable over Cragun under 35 U.S.C. § 103, and solicits reconsideration.

Accordingly the applicant submits that new dependent claim 8 is a fortiori patentable and should also be allowed.

The Rejection of Independent Claim 4, Now New Independent

Claim 9, on Cragun Overcome Under § 102

The O.A. states, "Regarding claim 4, Cragun teaches using a selection method to choose and make the blocking image disappear and reveal the advertising, taught as the use of a pop-up dialog in response to a user action (at col. 16, lines 47-50) that allows the user to de-select images from a blocking list, at col. 13, lines 40-46, which allows a user to view selected images. Cragun further discloses a blocking list that records selected images to block or hide from a user every time a page is loaded with images on the list (see col. 10, lines 38-48), thus allowing for a user to be shielded from images or advertisements without taking action."

Independent claim 4 is canceled and is replaced by new independent claim 9.

New claim 9 amends claim 4 that was rewritten for the reasons discussed above under the headings "The Objections to Claim 4" and "The Rejection of Claim 4 Under § 112 Overcome".

The applicant respectfully disagrees that Cragun describes and anticipates the novel physical features of new claim 9, as stated in the rejection.

New independent claim 9 is written with the same overall novel structure as independent claim 1, yet using differently worded elements. Also new claim 9 recites two whereby clauses, whereas claim 1 recites one whereby clause.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

For brevity's sake, the same novelty arguments from claim 1 also apply to new claim 9 as discussed above under the heading "The Rejection of Original Claim 1 on Cragun under § 102 Overcome".

The differently worded elements of new claim 9 are recited in place of the corresponding elements of claim 1, as follows:

1. "superimposing" of claim 9 corresponds to: "substantially conceal" of claim 1.
2. "non-advertising illustration" corresponds to: "image or images of a blocking nature" and "blocking image or images".
3. "internet advertisement" corresponds to: "internet advertising".
4. "remove itself" corresponds to: "disappear".
5. "selected" and "selecting" corresponds to: "selection method".
6. "person" corresponds to: "human".
7. "exposed and able to convey" corresponds to: "reveal".
8. "its contents" corresponds to: "internet advertising"
9. "shielded" corresponds to: "blocking nature".
10. "shown" corresponds to: "reveal".
11. "wishes to" corresponds to: "wants".

From the reasons discussed, the applicant submits that new independent claim 9 clearly recites novel physical features that distinguish over Cragun under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Therefore applicant submits that new claim 9 is allowable over Cragun and solicits reconsideration and allowance.

**New Claim 9 Produces New and Unexpected Results and Hence
Is Unobvious and Patentable Over Cragun Under § 103**

These distinctions are submitted to be of patentable merit because of the new and unexpected results that flow from the novel structure of new claim 9, or any modification thereof.

As mentioned, since the novel structure of new independent claim 9 is the same as the novel structure of independent claim 1, but with differently worded elements, new claim 9 produces the same new and unexpected results as claim 1.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Thus for brevity's sake, these new and unexpected results of new claim 9 are discussed above under the heading "Claim 1 Produces New and Unexpected Results and Hence Is Unobvious and Patentable Over Cragun Under § 103".

New Claim 9 Is Unobvious Over Cragun Under § 103 for the Following Additional Reasons:

As mentioned, the new and unexpected results for new independent claim 9 are the same as independent claim 1.

Thus for brevity's sake, the additional reasons that new claim 9 is unobvious over Cragun is discussed above in the heading "Claim 1 is Unobvious Over Cragun Under § 103 for the Following Additional Reasons:".

However there are unique unsuggested modification reasons of new claim 9:

Unsuggested Modifications: Cragun lacks any suggestion that his invention should be modified in the following manners required to meet claim 9.

Again since claim 9 has the same novel structure as claim 1 but with differently worded elements, the same arguments from claim 1 apply to the first 2 unsuggested modifications of Cragun to meet claim 9, explained as follows:

- (1) The unsuggested modification of Cragun at col. 16, lines 47-50, is discussed above for claim 1 in the subheading "Unsuggested Modification:", reason# (2) and the same argument applies to meet claim 9, but with the differently worded elements as discussed.
- (2) The unsuggested modification of Cragun at col. 13, lines 40-46, is discussed above for claim 1 in the subheading "Unsuggested Modification:", reason# (3) and the same argument applies to meet claim 9, but with the differently worded elements as discussed.
- (3) The O.A. states, in part, "Cragun also teaches using a selection method to...reveal the advertising, taught as the use of a pop-up dialog in response to a user action (at col. 16, lines 47-50 that allows the user to de-select images from a block list, at col. 13, lines 40-46, which allows a user to view selected images."

What Cragun teaches at col. 16, lines 47-50 and at col. 13, lines 40-46 are quoted above for claim 1 in the subheading "Unsuggested Modifications:".

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Cragun at col. 16, lines 47-50 and at col. 13, lines 40-46, does not teach the function of “reveal the advertising”.

Instead Cragun teaches a user requests to block, hide, configure-blocking images, and also teaches that a user can remove entries from blocking list so that blocked or hidden images are no longer blocked or hidden.

Cragun, in the two quotes, does not teach the internet advertisement that is **exposed** of claim 9, or elsewhere in his invention at all. These results of Cragun are very different than claim 9 because a person is **shielded** without taking any action from the internet advertisement of the claim, and the advertisement is **exposed** only when the person wishes to.

Therefore Cragun at col. 16, lines 47-50 and at col. 13, lines 40-46 lacks any suggestion that it should be modified in a manner required to meet claim 9.

(4) The O.A. states “Cragun further discloses a blocking list that records selected images to block or hide from a user every time a page is loaded with images on the list (see col. 10, lines 38-48), thus allowing for a user to be shielded from images or advertisements without taking action.”

Instead Cragun discloses at col. 10, lines 38-48, (without numbers), “Image-URL contains the complete URL address of the image data that is to be blocked. This URL is embedded within page 850, as shown in FIG. 8. (URLs are allowed to be incomplete in HTML documents, but browser will determine and use the complete URL.) Referring again to FIG. 7b, notice that the contents of image-URL will be blocked regardless from which web page it is embedded. Thus if multiple web pages embed the same URL, browser will block the image regardless of which web page embeds it. In this example, image-URL field contains

“http://www.searchengine.com/images/freegift.gif”.

Cragun teaches at col. 10, lines 38-48, that image-URL contains the complete URL address of the image data that is to be blocked. Cragun teaches throughout his invention that in response to a user request to block an unmodified viewable image, the image data has a control tag that is recorded in a blocking list. In fact, in the paragraph before lines 38-48, Cragun teaches in lines 31-33, “browser has displayed the fields in blocking list that are available for the user to modify.”

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Thus Cragun does not teach that a user is shielded from images or advertisements without taking action because to block or hide images in a blocking list is in response to a user request, and needs a **requesting action** from a user of his invention. This required user requesting result of Cragun is very different than claim 9 because **a person, without taking any action, is shielded** from the internet advertisement of the claim.

Therefore Cragun at col. 10, lines 38-48 lacks any suggestion that it should be modified in a manner required to meet claim 9.

From the reasons discussed, the applicant submits new independent claim 9 produces valuable new, unexpected, and different results and hence is unobvious and patentable over Cragun under 35 U.S.C § 103.

Accordingly, the applicant submits that new claim 9 is allowable over Cragun and solicits reconsideration and allowance.

**Claim 6, Now New Dependent Claim 11, Is A Fortiori Patentable
Over Cragun**

The new dependent claim 11 incorporates all the subject matter of new independent claim 9 and adds additional subject matter which makes the claim a fortiori and independently patentable over Cragun.

Claim 6 is canceled and is replaced by new claim 11.

New claim 11 amends canceled claim 6 in the following ways with the accompanying reasons:

1. The phrase “methods like a mouse click method,” is deleted to make the claim clear, logical, and precise under § 112, second paragraph, and to broaden the claim in concise language under § 112.
2. The phrase “keyboard keys or “ is deleted to make the claim clear, logical, and precise under § 112, second paragraph, and to broaden the claim in concise language under § 112.
3. The word “system” is added after the word “keys” to make the claim clear, logical, and precise under § 112, second paragraph because a method claim cannot be made dependent up an apparatus claim.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

4. The phrase “method, a touch-screen method, a stylus method, and a voice recognition method.” is deleted to make the claim clear, logical, and precise under § 112, second paragraph, and to broaden the claim in concise language under § 112.

The applicant submits that new claim 11 amends canceled claim 6 to distinctly claim the subject matter, and to make the claim clear and understandable and requests reconsideration.

Therefore the applicant solicits allowance of new claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Rejection of Claim 6, Now New Claim 11, on Cragun

Overcome Under § 102

The O.A. states, “Regarding claim 6, Cragun teaches a selection method using any manner of pointing device (embodied in the disclosure as a mouse), or combination of devices, including a keyboard, at col. 16, lines 50-54. The claimed touch-screen, stylus, and voice recognition are well known input methods.”

Cragun describes at col. 16, lines 50-54 (without numbers), “In an alternative embodiment, the user could select window with any manner of pointing device, or a combination of pointing devices, or a combination of a pointing device and keyboard.”

As mentioned claim 6 is canceled and is replaced by new claim 11.

The applicant respectfully disagrees that Cragun describes and anticipates the novel physical features of new claim 11.

New claim 11 is novel over Cragun for the same reasons as those discussed above for referred independent claim 9 in the heading “The Rejection of Independent Claim 4, Now New Independent Claim 9, on Cragun Overcome Under § 102”.

In addition new claim 11 is novel over Cragun because the selecting feature of the claim is a selecting **system**. Instead Cragun describes at col. 16, lines 50-54, “with any manner of pointing **device**, or a combination of pointing **devices**, or a combination of a pointing **device** and keyboard.”

Thus Cragun describes a user of his invention could select using various **devices**, and never describes a keys **system** of claim 11.

As mentioned the O.A. states, “The claimed touch-screen, stylus, and voice recognition are well known input methods.”. As discussed in the above heading, these elements are deleted to make

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

the claim clear, logical, and precise under § 112, second paragraph, and to broaden the claim in concise language under § 112.

From the reasons discussed, the applicant submits that new claim 11 clearly recites novel physical features that distinguish over MacMillan under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Therefore applicant submits that new claim 11 is allowable over Cragun and solicits reconsideration and allowance.

New Claim 11 Produces New and Unexpected Results and Hence Is Unobvious and Patentable Over Cragun Under § 103

These distinctions are submitted to be of patentable merit because the novel subject matter of new claim 11 is unobvious and hence even more patentable under § 103 since it adds additional subject matter over Cragun, or any modification thereof.

New claim 11 refers to new independent claim 9.

As discussed above under the heading “The Rejection of Independent Claim 4, Now New Independent Claim 9, on Cragun Overcome Under § 102”, new independent claim 9 has the same novel structure as independent claim 1, yet with differently worded elements.

Thus the reasons that new claim 11 produces new and unexpected results include those for referred new independent claim 9, that are the same reasons for independent claim 1 yet with differently worded elements.

For brevity’s sake, the reasons new claim 11 produces new and unexpected results are discussed above in the heading “Claim 1 Produces New and Unexpected Results and Hence Is Unobvious and Patentable Over Cragun Under § 103”.

In addition new claim 11 has the same novel structure as new claim 8, which refers to independent claim 1 yet with the differently worded elements with the exception that new claim 11 does not recite the function of new claim 8, “to choose and make said blocking image or images disappear.”

Thus for brevity’s sake, the new and unexpected results of new claim 11 are the same as new claim 8, and are discussed above under the heading “New Claim 8 Produces New and Unexpected Results and Hence Is Unobvious and Patentable Over Cragun Under § 103”.

New Claim 11 Is Unobvious Over Cragun Under § 103 for the

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Following Additional Reasons:

The reasons that new claim 11 is unobvious include those for referred new independent claim 9, that are the same reasons as independent claim 1 yet with differently worded elements as discussed above. For brevity's sake, the reasons that new claim 11 is unobvious include the reasons discussed above in the heading "Claim 1 is Unobvious Over Cragun for the Following Additional Reasons:".

As mentioned, new claim 11 has the same novel structure as new claim 8 yet with the differently worded elements. The exception is that new claim 11 does not recite the function of new claim 8 "to choose and make said blocking image or images disappear."

Thus for brevity's sake, the additional reasons that new claim 11 is unobvious over Cragun are discussed above in the heading "New Claim 8 is Unobvious Over Cragun Under § 103 for the Following Additional Reasons:", **except** for the reasons in subheadings "Unexpected Results" and "Different Combination".

Therefore the applicant submits that new claim 11 produces valuable new, unexpected, and different results and hence is unobvious and patentable over Cragun under 35 U.S.C § 103, and solicits reconsideration.

Accordingly the applicant submits that new dependent claim 11 is a fortiori patentable and should also be allowed.

New Dependent Claims 12 to 15 Are A Fortiori Patentable Over Cragun

New dependent claims 12, 13, 14 and 15 incorporate all the subject matter of claim 9 and add additional subject matter which makes them a fortiori and independently patentable over Cragun.

New claims 12, 13, 14, and 15 are added new claims.

New claims 12 to 15 are novel over Cragun for the same reasons as those discussed above for referred independent claim 9 in the heading "The Rejection of Independent Claim 4, Now New Independent Claim 9, on Cragun Overcome Under § 102".

The new and unexpected results for new claims 12 to 15 include those discussed for claim 9 above in the headings "New Claim 9 Produces New and Unexpected Results and Hence

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Is Unobvious and Patentable Over Cragun Under § 103” and “New Claim 9 Is Unobvious Over Cragun Under § 103 for the Following Additional Reasons:”.

The additional reasons new claims 12, 13, 14, and 15 are unobvious are as follows:

Claim 12 additionally recites “The non-advertising illustration of Claim 9, further including animation.”

Claim 12 recites novel physical features that distinguish over Cragun because the animation of the claim is superimposed over an internet advertisement as the first default step. Cragun does not describe and anticipate the novel physical feature of animation that shields internet advertisement of claim 12 because his invention first displays images on a generated unmodified document.

Claim 12 produces the new and unexpected results of garnering the full and undivided attention of a person when he or she selects the animation to expose the internet advertisement, which increases the value of the internet advertisement. Cragun shows very different results than the results of claim 12.

Claim 13 additionally recites “The device of Claim 9, further including an internet advertising for superimposing over said internet advertisement.”

Claim 13 recites novel physical features that distinguish over Cragun because an internet advertising is superimposed over another internet advertisement. Cragun does not describe and anticipate these novel physical features of claim 13.

Claim 13 produces the new and unexpected results of garnering the full and undivided attention of a person when he or she selects the superimposing internet advertising to expose the internet advertisement, which increases the value of the internet advertisement. Cragun shows very different results than the results of claim 13.

Claim 14 additionally recites “The internet advertisement of Claim 9, further including said non-advertising illustration of said device to remove itself after a predetermined time.

Claim 14 recites novel physical features that distinguish over Cragun because the internet advertisement of the claim is exposed **autonomously** after a predetermined time, for example, after 2 minutes. Cragun does not describe and anticipate the novel physical features of claim 14

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

because all of the images of his invention that are no longer to be blocked or hidden are **in response to a user request**.

Claim 14 produces a new and unexpected result of potentially generating significant internet advertisement revenue effectively from the high visibility of the exposed internet advertisement. Cragun shows very different results than the results of claim 14.

The new and unexpected results of claims 12, 13 and to a similar extent claim 14 are to garner the full and undivided attention of people to internet advertisements. The high visibility of the exposed internet advertisement of the claims produces an increased value, and potentially generates significant internet advertisement revenue. These results of the claims are very different than Cragun because his invention selectively blocks, hides, configure-blocking, and modifies the images on display, which in fact actually reduces the visibility of his images.

Claim 15 additionally recites “The device of Claim 9, further including said non-advertising illustration, said internet advertisement, said device for superimposing said non-advertising illustration over said internet advertisement, said non-advertising illustration to go into action and remove itself when selected by said person, said internet advertisement is exposed and able to convey said contents, said person without taking any action is shielded from said internet advertisement by said non-advertising illustration, said internet advertisement is shown only if said person wishes to by selecting said non-advertising illustration, an internet network with internet/television hybrids, a keys system, said non-advertising illustration includes animation, an internet advertising for superimposing over said internet advertisement, and said non-advertising illustration of said device that removes itself after a predetermined time.”

Claim 15 recites novel physical features that distinguish over Cragun because his invention does not describe and anticipate these novel physical features of claim 15.

Claim 15 produces new and unexpected results over Cragun because the internet advertisement of the claim is superimposed over so that a person is shielded from the internet advertisement as the first default step. Cragun shows very different results than the results of claim 15.

From the reasons discussed, the applicant submits that new claims 12, 13, 14, and 15 are clearly not described, anticipated and shown by Cragun because of the facts that the claims (a) are novel under 35 U.S.C § 102, and (b) produces valuable new, unexpected, and different results and

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

hence is unobvious and patentable over Cragun under 35 U.S.C § 103, and solicits reconsideration.

Accordingly the applicant submits that new dependent claims 12, 13, 14, and 15 are a fortiori patentable and should also be allowed.

New Dependent Claims 16 to 19 Are A Fortiori Patentable Over Cragun

New dependent claims 16, 17, 18, and 19 incorporate all the subject matter of claim 1 and add additional subject matter which makes them a fortiori and independently patentable over Cragun. New claims 16, 17, 18, and 19 are added new claims.

New claims 16 to 19 are novel over Cragun for the same reasons as discussed above for referred independent claim 1 in the heading “The Rejection of Claim 1 on Cragun Overcome Under § 102”.

The new and unexpected results for new claims 16 to 19 include those discussed for claim 1 above in the headings “Claim 1 Produces New and Unexpected Results and Hence Is Unobvious and Patentable Over Cragun Under § 103” and “Claim 1 is Unobvious Over Cragun for the Following Additional Reasons:”.

The additional reasons new claims 16, 17, 18, and 19 are unobvious are as follows:

Claim 16 additionally recites “The images or images of Claim 1, further including a digital video of said blocking nature of sufficient size to substantially conceal said internet advertising space.”

Claim 16 recites novel physical features that distinguish over Cragun because the digital video of the claim substantially conceals an internet advertising space as the first default step.

Cragun does not describe and anticipate the novel physical feature of digital video that shields internet advertising of claim 16 because his invention first displays images on a generated unmodified document.

Claim 16 produces the new and unexpected results of garnering the full and undivided attention of a human when he or she selects the digital video to reveal the internet advertising, which increases the value of the internet advertising. Cragun shows very different results than the results of claim 16.

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Claim 17 additionally recites “The second means of Claim 1, wherein said image or images is made of an internet advertisement of said blocking nature to substantially conceal said internet advertising space.”

Claim 17 recites novel physical features that distinguish over Cragun because an internet advertisement substantially conceals an internet advertising.

Cragun does not describe and anticipate these novel physical features of claim 17.

Claim 17 produces the new and unexpected results of garnering the full and undivided attention of a human when he or she selects the internet advertisement to reveal the internet advertising, which increases the value of the internet advertising. Cragun shows very different results than the results of claim 17.

Claim 18 additionally recites “The internet advertising of Claim 1, further including said internet advertising that is revealed after a predetermined time.”

Claim 18 recites novel physical features that distinguish over Cragun because the internet advertising of the claim is revealed **autonomously** after a predetermined time, for example, after 2 minutes. Cragun does not describe and anticipate the novel physical features of claim 18 because all of the images of his invention that are no longer to be blocked or hidden are in response to a **user request**.

Claim 18 produces a new and unexpected result of potentially generating significant internet advertising revenue effectively from the high visibility of the revealed internet advertising.

Cragun shows very different results than the results of claim 18.

The new and unexpected results of claims 16, 17, and to a similar extent claim 18 are to garner the full and undivided attention of people to internet advertisings. The high visibility of the revealed internet advertising of the claims produces an increased value, and potentially generates significant internet advertising revenue. These results of the claims are very different than Cragun because his invention selectively blocks, hides, configure-blocking, and modifies the images on display, which in fact actually reduces the visibility of his images.

Claim 19 additionally recites “The first means of Claim 1, further including said blocking and revealing said internet advertising, said image or images of said blocking nature, said internet

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

advertising, said second means to substantially conceal said internet advertising, said selection method to choose and make said blocking image or images disappear, said third means to reveal said internet advertising, said human can view and hear said internet advertising only if said human wants, an internet network with internet/television hybrids for blocking and revealing said internet advertising, a keys method to choose and make said blocking image or images disappear, a digital video of said blocking nature of sufficient size to substantially conceal said internet advertising space, said image or images is made of an internet advertisement of said blocking nature to substantially conceal said internet advertising space, and said internet advertising that is revealed after a predetermined time.”

Claim 19 recites novel physical features that distinguish over Cragun because his invention does not describe and anticipate these novel physical features of claim 19.

Claim 19 produces new and unexpected results over Cragun because the internet advertising of the claim is substantially concealed so that it is blocked from a human as the first default step.

Cragun shows very different results than the results of claim 19.

From the reasons discussed, the applicant submits that new claims 16, 17, 18, and 19 are clearly not described, anticipated and shown by Cragun because of the facts that the claims (a) are novel under 35 U.S.C § 102, and (b) produces valuable new, unexpected, and different results and hence is unobvious and patentable over Cragun under 35 U.S.C § 103, and solicits reconsideration.

Accordingly the applicant submits that new dependent claims 16, 17, 18, and 19 are a fortiori patentable and should also be allowed.

Conditional Request for Constructive Assistance

The applicant has amended the claims of this application so that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure which is also unobvious. If, for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, the applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2173.02 and § 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

No Combination of References

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

There is no improper combination of references because the O.A. cites the single reference of Cragun.

Acknowledgement of Allowed Claims

The applicant has rewritten claims 2 and 5 as new claims 7 and 10 to comply with the § 112 rejection, and further amended new claims 7 and 10 under § 112 to distinctly claim the subject matter.

The applicant acknowledges the allowance of new claims 7 and 10 which amends canceled claims 2 and 5, respectively, because the claims were rejected only under 35 USC § 112.

Conclusion

For all the reasons given above, the applicant respectfully submits that the claims comply with § 112, the claims define over the prior art under § 102 because the internet advertisings are blocked as a first step, and the claimed distinctions are of patentable merit under § 103 because of the new results provided when the blocked internet advertising is first revealed.

Accordingly, the applicant submits that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action the applicant respectfully solicits.

Very respectfully,



Lee DeGross

Enc: New sheet 4/4 of a drawing and a copy of sheet 4/4 marked in red to indicate the voluntary corrections to Fig. 4.

400 Park Place, #1H
Fort Lee, NJ 07024
Tel. (201) 592-9999

Lee DeGross Appn. Number 10/022,627 Exam. Group/Art Unit 2173 Amnt. A contd.

Certificate of Mailing. I hereby certify that this correspondence, and attachments, if any, will be deposited with the United States Postal Service by First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" on the date below.

2009 Nov. 27

Lee DeGross